

REMARKS

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

To expedite prosecution, claims **29** and **147** have been amended to recite that “each unique transform produces an image of the object at a different image location, whereby there are 2^N different image locations, wherein adjacent image locations are separated from each other by a constant separation distance”. Newly added claim **175** depends from claim **29** and recites that “each addressable optical element is characterized by a first state and a second state” and that “in their first states the focal lengths are the same for all N addressable elements, and wherein in their second states, the focal lengths of the N addressable elements are unique and, except for a smallest second state focal length, each second state focal length is twice as large as another second state focal length.” Newly added claim **176** depends from claim **147** and recites that “each randomly addressable optical element is characterized by a first state and a second state” and that “in their first states the focal lengths are the same for all N randomly addressable elements, and wherein in their second states, the focal lengths of the N randomly addressable elements are unique and, except for a smallest second state focal length, each second state focal length is twice as large as another second state focal length.” Support for these features can be found in the specification as filed, e.g., at page 14, lines 6-12, the section bridging page 19, line 1 to page 21, line 12 and in FIG. 1 and FIGs. 2A-2C. As such, no new matter has been entered.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 USC 102(b) – Nishimoto (GB2171535)

Claims **29-36**, **38-40**, **43-53**, **147-149**, **151-157**, **159** and **161-174** were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishimoto GB 2171353. In rejecting the claims it is argued that Nishimoto discloses an optical processor comprising an optical module 120 having a plurality of addressable optical elements and other features of the rejected claims. In rejecting the claims it is argued that Nishimoto discloses an optical processor comprising one or more optical modules including N addressable optical elements, where $N > 2$ and for which 2^n addressable filter functions produce 2^n unique transforms between an object and an image.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. In traversing the rejections, the Applicant submits that Nishimoto neither teaches nor suggests that adjacent image locations are separated from each other by a constant separation distance as set forth in claims **29** and **147**. As such claims **29** and **147** are believed to be allowable over Nishimoto. In addition, claims **30-53** and

148-174 depend from claims **29** and **147** respectively and recite additional features therefor. As such, and for the same reasons set forth above, the Applicant submits that these dependent claims are also allowable over Nishimoto.

NEW CLAIMS 175 and 176

- 5 New claims **175** and **176** are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record. Claims **175** and **176** depend from claims **29** and **147** respectively and recite additional features therefor. As such, these dependent claims are believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above. In addition, the Applicant submits that Nishimoto is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of the features of these claims. As such, for at least this additional reason, claims **175** and **176** are
10 believed to be patentable over Nishimoto.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant submits that, for the reasons set forth above, the restriction requirement is improper and all of the pending claims are allowable. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the amendment, reconsider the application and issue a Notice of
15 Allowance in the next Office Action.

Very respectfully,



Joshua D. Isenberg, Reg. No. 41,088
Attorney of record

JDI PATENT
809 Corporate Way
Fremont, CA 94539
Tel: (510) 668-0965
Fax: (510) 668-0239